

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/065,443	Applicant(s) SECOND ET AL.	
	Examiner Angela A. Armstrong	Art Unit 2626	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Angela A. Armstrong. (3)_____.

(2) Jon Backenstose. (4)_____.

Date of Interview: 06 September 2006.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: claim 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Polanyi.


Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant argued the virtual reality subsystem was not taught by Polanyi. The Examiner indicated the teachings of the specification suggest the system is text-based which is disclosed by Polanyi. Applicant agreed to review the specification and provide arguments to address the specific teachings of the virtual reality subsystem as a graphical three-dimensional representation or a text-based system in response to the Office Action. The Examiner agreed to fully consider all arguments of the response and respond accordingly..